

REMARKS

In the last Office Action, claims 1, 3-8, 11-18, 21-24 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants' prior art disclosure in Fig. 3 ("APD") in view of Winer (US 5,796,401), Okazaki (US 7,079,177), and Kelman (US 6,850,896).

Applicant respectfully traverses the prior art rejection of claims 1, 3-8, 11-18, 21-24 and 26. As set forth in detail below, the combined teachings of APD, Winer, Okazaki and Kelman do not disclose or suggest the structural and functional combinations of the user interface recited in claims 1, 3-8, 11-18, 21-24 and 26. Applicant therefore requests reconsideration of his application as set forth below.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a computer user interface for creating a printing template for analysis results of an analyzer. Independent claim 13 is directed to a user interface for a sample analyzer having a computer. Independent claim 24 is directed to a user interface for creating a printing template. Each of independent claims 1, 13 and 24 define with specificity the specific items to be displayed by the display means and edited by group editing means.

More specifically, independent claim 1 recites display means having a printing image displaying area for displaying a printing image of a report of analysis results of the analyzer, and an item displaying area for displaying a list of items containing titles and their contents comprised of characters or digits and corresponding to analysis conditions and configured to be arranged in the printing image displaying area. Claim 1 further recites group editing means for performing group editing of items containing titles and their contents in the same group by performing character position alignment of the first characters of the contents or digit alignment of the digits of the contents. Independent claims 13 and 24 recite similar subject matter. No corresponding structural and functional combinations are disclosed or suggested by the combined teachings of APD, Winer, Okazaki, and Kelman.

As recognized by the Examiner, the primary reference to APD does not teach group editing means, and specifically the specific function of performing group editing of items containing titles and their contents in the same group by performing character position alignment of the first characters of the contents or digit alignment of the digits of the contents.

The Examiner cited the secondary reference to Winer as disclosing a group editing function. According to the Examiner, "aligning the items (the dotted boxes, as per the teaching of Winer) in Fig. 3 of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art, which contains titles and their contents, would also perform character position alignment on the first characters of each of the items because the text would be moved along with the item because they are part of the item." The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the computer interface of APD by adopting the editing function of Winer in order to eliminate the task of editing items one at a time. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of Winer and corresponding conclusion of obviousness to arrive at the claimed invention.

The alignment of items in accordance with the teachings of Winer may lead to character position alignment on the first characters of each of the items. However, each of independent claims 1, 13 and 24 requires items containing titles and their contents, and group editing means for performing group editing of items containing titles and their contents in the same group by performing character position alignment of the first characters of the contents or digit alignment of the digits of the contents. Applicants respectfully submit that alignment of the items in Winer

(i.e., the dotted boxes as per Winer) would not result in performing character position alignment of the first characters of the contents or digit alignment of the digits of the contents, as required by each of independent claims 1, 13 and 24.

APD relates to a report for analyzing results in an analyzer. In contrast, Winer relates to text and graphic display systems and to a system for designing a layout for a display screen, such as the display screen of a personal computer. Thus, Winer and APD are directed to different industrial applications. Unlike in Winer, since APD relates to a report for analyzing results in an analyzer, alignment of characters and of digits is particularly necessary. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been led to modify the teachings of APD in view of the teachings of Winer to arrive at the specific display means and group editing means and corresponding functions recited in independent claims 1, 13 and 24.

Moreover, independent claim 1 requires drag-and-drop means for enabling a user to drag-and-drop an item from the item displaying area to a desired position within the image displaying area where a report of analysis results is displayed so that the selected item is displayed in the report of analysis results. Claim 1 further requires means for attaching the dropped item to the end of an existing item and

recognizing both items as information belonging to the same group when the existing item is at the same position as the dropped item. Thus, independent claim 1 requires producing an arbitrary group by use of drag-and-drop from a population comprising independent items not belonging to any one of groups, and means for adding items to the produced group one by one.

The Examiner recognized that APD, as modified by Winer, does not teach the foregoing structural and functional features recited in independent claim 1. The Examiner contends, however, that these structures and corresponding functions are taught by the drag-and-drop techniques disclosed by Okazaki. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the drag-and-drop techniques of Okazaki with the teachings of APD, as modified by Winer, in order to expedite the creation of the printing template. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's contention, interpretation of the references, and corresponding conclusion of obviousness.

Okazaki discloses means for moving an item belonging to a certain group to another group using drag-and-drop. The item has an attribute showing to which group the item belongs, and Okazaki discloses means for renewing the attribute, that is, changing a belonging group to another. Accordingly,

Okazaki does not disclose or suggest the creation of an arbitrary group of independent items not belonging to any one of groups, nor any means for adding independent items to an existing group, as required by independent claim 1. Since Okazaki does not disclose or suggest these structural and functional features, it does not cure the deficiencies of APD as modified by Winer. Kelman also does not cure the deficiencies of APD as modified by Winer and Okazaki. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been led to modify the references to attain the claimed subject matter.

Independent claims 13 and 24 similarly patentably distinguish from the combined teachings of APD, Winer, Okazaki, and Kelman. More specifically, claim 13 requires drag-and-drop means for enabling a user to drag-and-drop items from the item list onto the image displaying area using an input device connected to the computer, and means for appending a dropped item onto an end of an existing item and recognizing both items as belonging to the same group when the existing item is located at the same position as the dropped item. Independent claim 24 requires drag-and-drop means for enabling a user to drag-and-drop an item from the item list to a desired position within the printing image so that the selected item is displayed in the report, and means for attaching the dropped item to the end of an existing item and

recognizing both items as information belonging to the same group when the existing item is at the same position as the dropped item. No corresponding structural and functional combinations are disclosed or suggested by APD, Winer, Okazaki, and Kelman, either alone or in combination.

Claims 3-8, 11-12, 21 and 14-18, 22, 23 and 26 depend on and contain all of the limitations of independent claims 1, 13 and 24, respectively, and, therefore, distinguish from the prior art of record at least in the same manner as independent claims 1, 13 and 24.

In view of the foregoing, favorable reconsideration and passage of the application to issue are most respectfully requested. In the event the Examiner determines that something further need be done to place the application in allowable form, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number whereupon any outstanding matter will be promptly attended to.

Respectfully submitted,

ADAMS & WILKS
Attorneys for Applicant

By: 

Bruce L. Adams
Reg. No. 25,386

17 Battery Place
Suite 1231
New York, NY 10004
(212) 809-3700

MAILING CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date indicated below.

Deborah Chen

Name



Signature

AUGUST 4, 2008

Date